

T. Zane Reeves, PhD
PA 525 (DSH 132)
Spring 2019
HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

Instructor information

Your course instructor is a Regents Professor of Public Administration at the University of New Mexico and a practicing labor/employment arbitrator with the National Academy of Arbitrators, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, American Arbitration Association, California State Mediation and Conciliation Service, US Postal Service/American Postal Workers, Federal Aviation Administration/National Association of Air Traffic Controllers, and Pantex Guards Assoc. /BWXT Corporation. He received his PhD from the University of Southern California and MA from UCLA. Dr. Reeves has authored or co-authored ten books in areas of dispute resolution, labor-management relations, human resources management and modern European history as well as numerous academic articles and professional publications. He serves as a grievance hearing officer to a wide variety of public, private, and not-for-profit organizations and was a Personnel Hearing Officer for the City of Albuquerque from 1987 to 2012. Dr. Reeves currently is Vice-Chairperson of the City of Albuquerque Personnel Board, on the Board of Directors of Outcomes, Inc. Zane Reeves may be reached anytime at tzane@unm.edu. Office hours are made by appointment only for Saturdays.

Goals

This course is a graduate level introduction to the concepts, policies, and practices of federal, state, and local jurisdictions in human resource management and development. Particular attention is given to investigating human resources issues in these areas. It is an operating assumption that public personnel administration is an integral part of human resources management, but is not the exclusive purview of HR specialists. Rather, it is a critical function shared with line managers and employees in the public sector.

Objectives

Students will be exposed to public human resources management as a systematic approach rather than exploring its fragmented or isolated components, i.e. performance appraisal, affirmative action, testing or labor-management relations. Personnel policy making is presented as a deliberate, systematic approach, not as a neutral activity practiced by personnel “technicians”. Students are encouraged to investigate and research consequences or outcomes of HRM decisions in addition to various techniques. Students are asked to weigh different HRM utilization options by criteria of employee morale as well as organizational productivity. Among others, students will also learn to apply the following types of specific HRM administrative skills:

- (1) To weigh competing ethical considerations in making HRM decisions
- (2) To investigate HRM issues by preparing an evidence-based plan.
- (3) To select a fair and neutral investigator

- (4) To collect and analyze reactive and non-reactive data
- (5) To develop sound interviewing skills for structured and non-structured interviews.
- (6) To make findings of fact based on evidence
- (7) To reach reasonable conclusions after considering facts
- (8) To make recommendations for action by decision makers
- (9) To appreciate the following HRM tools and techniques:
 - a. To appraise and evaluate actual employee performance rather than non-job related factors such as personality traits.
 - b. To provide balanced appraisal feedback, both positive and negative, to employees.
 - c. To set up a performance evaluation system that enhances employee development while providing solid documentation.
 - d. To understand positive and corrective disciplinary concepts.
 - e. To develop constructive personnel policies and procedures which minimize disciplinary problems.
 - f. To appreciate the purposes and techniques of job evaluation.
 - g. To set up a system for evaluating position reclassification requests.
 - h. To compare the advantages and disadvantages of various compensation packages, and in particular “cafeteria” benefit options.
 - i. To develop a management philosophy, policies and procedures for monitoring employee leave programs.
 - j. To implement merit-based recruitment and selection concepts.
 - k. To construct fair and equitable techniques for resolving grievances in union and non-union work environments.
 - l. To develop a basic understanding of pay equity (comparable worth) and its impact on personnel management.
 - m. To understand how affirmative action goals, guidelines and timetables are set along with their major criticisms.
 - n. To evaluate the merits of group preference versus individual merit in employee selection decisions.
 - o. To implement procedures for minimizing gender harassment and other forms of discrimination in the work setting.
 - p. To evaluate the conflict between merit-based & political appointee systems.
 - q. To plan and prepare for the workforce of the future.
 - r. To write personnel policies that respect an employee’s privacy rights while on and off duty as well as define guidelines for employers.

In essence, the course combines emphases on theoretical issues of human resources management, the importance of policy making in setting expectations for a more productive public bureaucracy, transforming the workplace and the development of specific management skills.

Methodology

The course will utilize a variety of learning opportunities for students within the weekly analysis of case studies through lectures, discussion, and small group consensus building.

Readings

Reeves, T. Zane (2005) *Cases in Public Human Resource Management*, (2nd ed.), Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. Book may be purchased or rented from Amazon.com or Barnes & Noble.com. *It is not available in the UNM Bookstore.*

Reeves, T. Zane (2019), *Human Resource Management in Action: Investigating issues at work*, San Diego: Cognella Academic Publishing. Book may be ordered on-line through *University Readers Student Store* by creating an account (select UNM). *It is not available in the UNM Bookstore.*

Course Outline/Assignments and Agenda

January 26: Ten common HRM beliefs/myths

Readings: Reeves (2005) Preface
Reeves (2019) Preface

February 2: Searching for self-evident truths

Ethics in public service
Professional ethics
Cultural values versus individual ethics
Speaking truth to power

Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. I, “Searching for Self-Evident Truths”
Reeves (2005) Case #26 “The Cop and the Prostitute”

Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion questions #1 & #2 for “*Molly O’Rourke’s Stand*”
Reeves (2005) Discussion questions #1 on p. 141

February 9: Looking for acceptable facts

Finding the “facts”
Collecting and weighing evidence
Conducting a fair & neutral investigation

Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. II, “Looking for acceptable facts”
Reeves (2005) Case #4 “Paying the Tucson Police”

Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion questions #2 & #3 for “*Trouble in Loboland*”
Reeves (2005) Discussion question #3 on p. 25

February 16: The Neutral Fact Finder

Investigator competence and character
Purposes of the investigation
Organizational trust level
Employees as investigators

Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. III, “The Neutral Investigator”
Reeves (2005) Case #14 “Cultural Clash at the Cancer Center”

Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion questions #3 & #4
Reeves (2005) Discussion question #2 on p. 81

February 23: Considering interview evidence

Uses of reactive and non-reactive data in investigations
 Structured and non-structuring interviewing
 Preparing structured interviews
 Knowns, unknowns, and known unknowns
Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. IV., “Considering Interview Evidence”
 Reeves (2005) Case #13, “Jailhouse Follies”
Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion questions #1 & #2
 Reeves (2005) Discussion question #1 on p. 78

March 2: Considering documentary evidence

Improving perceptual skills
 Fact finding reliability
 Beliefs as facts
 Who is Bill Clinton?
 Evaluating evidence
Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. V, “Considering Documentary Evidence”
 Reeves (2005) Case #16, “Is Heavy Lifting an Essential Job Function?”
Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion questions #1 & #2
 Reeves (2005) Discussion question #1 on p. 91

March 9: Weighing credibility

Confusing evidence as facts
 What are *not* facts?
 Distortion tendencies
 Analyzing evidence for facts
 Human biases
Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. VI, “Weighing Credibility”
 Reeves (2005) Case Study #25, “What’s a Single Mom to do?”
Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion question #2
 Reeves (2005) Answer Discussion questions #1 & #3 on p. 133

March 16: Spring break (no class)

March 23: Investigating sexual misconduct

Four types of harassment claims
 Designing a fact finding investigation
 Making a recommendation for resolution
Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. VII, “Investigating sexual misconduct”
 Reeves (2005) Case #27, “Case of the Cuddly Custodian”
Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion question #1 & #3
 Reeves (2005) Discussion question #1 on p. 149

March 30: Inferring facts from evidence

External barriers & biases
 Organizational & cultural beliefs
 Historical myths as barriers
 Role of intuition and ignorance
 Prevailing paradigms of knowledge

Analyzing evidence to determine facts

Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. VIII, “Inferring facts from evidence”

Reeves (2005) Case #29, “Too Many Christmas Carols in the Winter Festival”

Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion Questions #1 & #2

Reeves (2005) Discussion Question #1 on 159

April 6: When Facts Don’t Add Up

Unreliable memory and memory distortion

Perception distortion

Inattentional blindness

Eyewitness errors

Cognitive & emotional blindness

Premature conclusions

Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. IX, “When facts don’t add up”

Readings (2005) Case #23, “Case of the Missing Portable Potty”

Homework: Readings (2019) Discussion Questions #1 & #3

Readings (2005) Discussion Question #1 on p. 125

April 13: Jumping to Conclusions

Tests of Just Cause

Non-disciplinary termination

Real world of instant decision-making

Role of intuition

Arrogant assumptions

Accusatory & problem-solving decisions

Acting reasonably & deliberately

Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. X., “Jumping to Conclusions”

Reeves (2005) Case #24 “Going Postal”

Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion Question #3

Reeves (2005) Discussion Questions #1 & #3 on p. 128

April 20: Improving Employee performance

Judging others at work

Appraising, not appraising

Formal evaluation, without judgment

Conducting an appreciative performance interview

Navajo Nation Performance Communication Process

Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. XI, “Improving Employee performance”

Reeves (2005) Case #19 “To Protect and to Serve”

Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion Questions #1 & #3

Reeves (2005) Discussion Question #3 on p. 106

April 27: Making Accusatory Recommendations

Traditional discipline

Discipline & unequal power

Fear as a Disincentive

Appreciative discipline

Constructive disciplinary options

Resignation in lieu of discharge

Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. XII, “Making Accusatory Recommendations”

Reeves (2005) Case #20 “Fearless Freddy Fuego”

Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion Question III

Reeves (2005) Discussion Questions #1 & #2 on p. 111

May 5: Making Recommendations for Action

Investigating for problem solving

Formulating an investigative plan

Avoiding the blame game

Readings: Reeves (2019) Ch. XIII, “Recommendations for Action”

Reeves (2005) Case Study #2 “Tom Collins Doesn’t Mix Well”

Homework: Reeves (2019) Discussion Questions #1 & #2

Reeves(2005) Discussion Question #3 on p. 14

Criteria for Evaluation

Students are expected to complete all course assignments in a professional and timely manner. In addition, class attendance is required. Specifically, the evaluation criteria are as follows:

Case studies must be turned in by specified dates. Students should prepare written responses to self-assessment exercises at the conclusion of each case study (or elsewhere) for submission and be prepared to discuss these cases in small groups. Response papers will be graded by: 1) the quality and depth of analysis, 2) expository writing style, 3) professionalism [grammar, spelling, and presentation], 4) and incorporation of outside [non-assigned] readings and research. Response papers are due via email by 9 a.m. on the date of each class (tzane@unm.edu). Late papers will be accepted, but the grade will be discounted. Students who are absent from class will be expected to send papers on time by email. Students who are unable to complete course requirements because of illness or accidents may be allowed to take an incomplete grade in those cases where a major portion of the work has been completed (50%+).

Participation in small group consensus building is a required activity. A student will be randomly selected to lead a group discussion on the designated case study. Student attendance is mandatory and full participation is expected.

Students will be graded by the following criteria:

A+ Truly outstanding performance on all case studies, insightful participation in classroom discussion, and timely completion of all Self-Assessment assignments.

A Excellent contribution on all case studies and through solid participation in classroom discussion.

A- Excellent contribution on most case studies and through consistent participation in classroom discussion.

B+ Excellent contribution on a majority of case studies and through consistent participation in classroom discussion.

B Solid contribution on a majority of case studies and through consistent participation in classroom discussion.

B- Solid contribution on at least half of case studies and through participation in classroom discussion.

C+ Unacceptable level of performance on most case studies and inconsistent participation in classroom discussion.